he designates as vitalistico-energetic. He might be called a monistic vitalist if that were not a contradiction in terms, He very emphatically insisted upon the teleological or goal-seeking nature, not only of the outward activities of the higher animals, but also of many of the processes in their tissues, processes of organization, of morphogenesis, of restitution of form and function, &c. ' The purposiveness of ontogenetic development is too evident to be denied seriously. It results from the convergence of manifold morphogenetic activities towards one sole end—that is, towards the formation of a marvellous functional unity, every part of which serves to maintain the life and guarantee the well-being of the whole. Nothing even remotely analogous is to be seen in any physico-chemical process of the inorganic world.'

And he proposed to solve all the problems presented by such ostensibly teleological activities by postulating the existence and operation in living organisms of a special form of energy which he endowed with the peculiarity of operating teleologically.

In his last book, *The Nature of Life* (1930), he wrote:

[c] Is it in keeping with a true scientific spirit to persist in denying that we have here something substantially different from ordinary phenomena of a purely physico-chemical nature, and to continue to contend that physico-chemical laws alone afford a sufficient explanation? Is it not more in accord with sound positive method to inquire whether by assuming a new form of energy always obedient to the general laws of

energetics, but endowed with well-defined elementary properties different from those of any form of energy in the inorganic world, it may not be possible to explain these characteristic properties of life ?' He proposed to call [c] the new form